

**REMARKS**

By the foregoing amendments, claims 1 and 10 and also claims 16 and 18 have been combined. The combined claims have, for convenience, been presented as new independent claims 23 and 24, which correspond to prior claims 10 and 18 exactly. Conforming dependency changes have been made in other claims.

Neither of prior claims 10 and 18 were rejection in the prior art rejections set forth in paragraphs 3-7 and 10. Accordingly, and as a result of the foregoing amendment, all of those rejections are now moot and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 10-12 and 16-20 were rejected on the grounds of a Section 101 double patenting over a copending application. This rejection is respectfully traversed and since the rejection is only provisional, no further response is needed at this time.

Claim 1 was also rejected on the grounds of obviousness type double patenting over claims of US 6,653,654 but this rejection is moot in light of the foregoing amendments.

Applicant submits that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Edward A. Meilman/  
Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant